UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

I Protest!

By ALSON H. ROBINSON

The Story of My Mind

Concluded

By GEORGE WILLIS COOKE

Race in Politics—Book Reviews

By FREDERICK STARR

VOLUME XCVI NUMBER 5

Chicago, October 19, 1925

of any permanent help or benefit, simply passes our comprehension. Yet these friends, including France's own official representatives, are tumbling over themselves to write a record which will make it impossible for the French government ever to borrow another dollar of America. The whole thing to us is just like a chapter out of "Alice In Wonderland." We refuse to live in such a world of unreality. The French debt should be paid, as any debt should be paid. Or, if it can't be paid, France should in honor confess herself a bankrupt, and make settlement accordingly. All this is as basic in this case as in the exactly similar case of our indebtedness to our butcher and our baker.

So far, so good! Now for the second article of our belief on this debt question. The debts recognized, and payment in full honestly begun, we believe that the United States should cancel them forthwith and *in toto, provided* that for such an act of unexampled generosity a decent *quid pro quo* is given by the nations concerned. That America can afford to cancel the debts is obvious. Indeed, it may well be argued that she cannot afford *not* to cancel the debts. The financial disturbance incident to their payment, and the moral ill-will created in European minds by our enforcement of the letter of our bond, will together cost more than the debts themselves are worth. Let them be cancelled then, as the Chinese indemnities were returned to Peking, in one great gesture of generosity for the benefit of all concerned! But *on condition!* Let these militaristic governments be released without condition, and we would have an orgy of wars and preparedness for wars that would make past history look infantile in comparison. Our cancellation, in other words, would be used to finance on a grander scale than ever the vast preparations now going forward in Europe for the next war. Look at France, for example! She can't pay the debts she owes America. Utterly impossible—no use talking about it at all! But she can pay for an expensive war in Morocco. She can pay for another expensive war in Syria. She can find ample funds to loan Poland and the Little Entente for the support of great armies. And she can pay out her millions of francs a month for her own great armaments on land and sea. No!—let the debts be cancelled only on the condition that these war preparations be stopped. Let disarmament be our *quid pro quo*. Let every dollar cancelled be a dollar subtracted from the military budgets of the nations concerned! This is a fair enough bargain. If it is not acceptable, then well and good—we know just where we stand. Money owed us is being used to prepare for another war which we shall again be asked to finance! No cancellations, then! Pay us every last dollar that you owe, and be quick about it, too!

In our issue for September 21st last, we stated our conviction, à propos Col. Mitchell's famous charges against the Army and Navy Departments, that high executives of government are not to be believed when they issue public statements. Last week we cited an instance of deliberate deceit on the part of Secretary Kellogg in the State Department. Now comes a fully demonstrated instance of the same kind on the part of Secretary Wilbur of the Navy Department. It will be remembered that, when the "Shenandoah" was destroyed, the widow of Commander Lansdowne charged that her husband had been opposed to the trip of the dirigible into the west, and had protested to his superiors against the perils involved. In the investigation of the disaster at Lakehurst, it was developed through sworn testimony that Mrs. Lansdowne's statements were correct. Ordered on June 10th to prepare his ship for flight to Minneapolis, Commander Lansdowne at once wrote to Rear-Admiral Eberle asking postponement of the flight until it would be "reasonably safe, later in the season." On June 19th, Admiral Eberle replied, ordering the commander of the "Shenandoah" to prepare for flight "immediately." On June 30th came a change of plan in Washington—the flight was to be delayed until "the latter part of August." On August 4th Lansdowne wrote again to his superiors, asking for a delay of the flight until the second week in September. The "Shenandoah" sailed on September 2nd, and fourteen hours later was a wreck, with Lansdowne dead. Then on September 9th, after Mrs. Lansdowne had spoken from out her crushing grief, came this official statement from Secretary Wilbur:

> Commander Lansdowne never protested against the flight in person or by communication to me or any one in the Department, and, on the contrary, expressed his satisfaction with it to his superiors and associates.

This requires no comment! Either Mr. Wilbur lied, or some one else in the Department lied. The widow of an heroic officer was slandered and the public deceived. Nice business!

Some day we hope to read a real *news*paper! We can see some of the headlines now. "Assembly of the League of Nations Adjourns. Members Disconsolate. Concede that League is a Failure." "Election Forecasts. Republican Candidate Concedes Victory to Opponent. Thinks Democratic Majority Should Total 100,000." "Poincaré Confesses War Guilt. Admits Plot With Russia To Isolate and Destroy Germany. Ex-President Weeps." "Red Menace Exaggerated, says President. Coolidge Laughs At Fears. Orders Ports Opened To Aliens Without Opinions Probe." "Hon. John Smith Buried. Funeral Rites Most Elaborate." Here would be news indeed! As it is, what boresome pre-digested stuff is poured out upon us every day! The League of Nations Assembly ends its sessions, and perfectly good

money is paid for long cable stories to the effect that Lord Robert Cecil and Professor Manley Hudson think the meeting a great success and the League stronger than ever. This—news! Or election day approaches, and all over the front pages we read that the Democrats claim victory by 90,000, and the Republicans claim victory by 100,000. This—*news! !* Or Poincaré writes an article or makes a speech about war guilt, and a whole column of valuable newspaper space is used to tell us that the Frenchman accuses Germany of sole responsibility. This—NEWS! ! ! Or President Coolidge denounces the Reds, or shuts out a Communist, or talks about Bolshevik propaganda, and the newspapers feature this as though it were—NEWS! ! ! ! Or a distinguished public man is buried, with organ and song, two bishops and a rector reading the service, a bronze casket, tons of flowers, and a long procession to the grave, and the newspapers tell us that everything was conducted "with the utmost simplicity." *NEWS! ! ! ! !* Give us the subject, and we will tell you days beforehand just what the newspapers will say. As a matter of hard, cold fact most news is written up before the event, according to a formula as precise and unchangeable as the recipe for custard pie. The football game, the fashionable wedding, the opening of Congress, the death of the great man—the reporter knows just what to say. The average newspaper is the last place in the world in which to find *news!*

Peter Ainslee, pastor of the Christian Temple, Baltimore, president of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, editor of the *Christian Union Quarterly,* brave and consistent Disciple of Christ, is slamming the denominational journals. Deploring denominationalism in every form, Dr. Ainslee rightly sees that these papers constitute "one of the factors in perpetuating denominationalism." He goes on, with heartening directness—

> The denominational journal is a part of the propaganda of party-policy. It is a call for loyalty to the denomination, and, therefore, for the perpetuation of division in the church of God. . . . If the Christiain mind is to think in terms of unity, it must not be disturbed by such hindrance to united thought as is given by denominational journals. In thinking we begin to find our way to fellowship. The mind needs helps, not hindrances, to that end. The denominational journal is a decided hindrance.

The *Christian Century,* superb representative of the type of "interdenominational journal" which Dr. Ainslee would substitute for the "denominational journal," endorses and applauds these sentiments. So do we, right heartily! Yet is there something to be said in support of the familiar denominational paper. This publication has a right to exist. It serves a purpose, and a proper purpose, too. The only trouble is in regarding it, as it regards itself, as a *religious paper.* Of course it is nothing of the sort! The "denominational journal" is not a religious paper at all, but a *trade paper.* It serves the interests and publishes the news of a particular private business—Presbyterianism, Methodism, Universalism, or what not—just as the furniture dealers' paper, the hardware men's paper, the jewelers' paper, serves the interests and publishes the news of these various trades. Let the denominational papers drop their religious pose and be classified where they belong—among the trade papers of the country!—and there will be no further trouble.

I Protest!

Everybody else is doing it, why not I?

Mr. Saklatvala protests against British rule in India. The British delegates protest against Mr. Saklatvala. Mr. Borah protests against the attitude of the British delegates and if you can find anybody who hasn't protested against Mr. Borah at some time or other, it is because you have missed the zest of this most engaging of indoor sports. Lest, like the climate of California, it should be over-looked, I propose a religious protest.

Let me begin with a very broad generalization, and see if I can substantiate it. It seems increasingly obvious that religion, in order to become a vital factor in the life of any age, shall constitute a sort of irrepressible protest. There is an interesting example of religious loyalty born of protest in the case of the Irish allegiance to the Catholic Church. Why is it that the Roman Church has such a hold on the people of that tortured and dramatic country, and why is it that here in America most of the priests are of Irish birth or extraction? Well, for an answer you have to go back to a political situation—the political and economic domination of the Irish by the English people. Now as it became obvious that the Irish couldn't do anything to free themselves politically, they resolved to adopt a religion unlike their dictators, and in that way show their independence. And you may lay it down as a general principle that when a state is dominated from without by some foreign power it will turn to religion as a compensating substitute. It is a case of national pathology if you please, but it is not an uncommon condition, and at any rate in so far as the religion of Ireland is concerned its strength is due to protest.

There is another example of this same thing in Bohemia.

Now in order to understand the force with which liberal religion is sweeping across Czechoslovakia—in order to understand why it was that the Pope recently refused to receive the delegates from Czechoslovakia—you have to go back in history at least to the year 1415 when John Huss was burned at the stake. He was a

protestant against the abuses of the Church a full century before Luther's time, and has been a vital personality in the life and thought of Bohemia for five hundred years. In 1630 during the thirty years war Bohemia was defeated by Austria which was staunchly Catholic. At the close of the last war Bohemia became an independent country and a great movement for liberal religion developed. It is all based upon a protest. If you will follow the religious tendencies in Poland or in Transylvania you will find that these religious movements are a symbol of the desire of these people for political independence. It ought to be said that it doesn't make much difference what religion you profess, that you may be a Catholic in Ireland or a Unitarian in Transylvania; but the fact is that probably in neither case would these movements have amounted to much had they not sprung from the loins of Protest.

Now we are not living in Warsaw in the days of Socinus, nor in Kolozvar in the days of Frances David, nor in Bohemia in the days of John Huss. By the merest accident of birth we happen to be living in the twentieth century in a country in which such religious and political oppression as there is assumes less obvious forms. In other words we are rather too comfortable to protest very vigorously. To be sure certain forms of liberal Christianity began as theological protests, but nobody seems to have a very clear idea what the protests were about, and those who do know about them are not especially excited. The question, therefore rises, whether there is any protest today, comparable in our time to the protest which gave to the church that strength which in days of old moved earth and heaven.

In the first place, on behalf of the church, I protest against the exclusion of the scientific method in religion. There is something strange about the conservatism of religion as compared with the forward looking hopeful attitude of science. It is no wonder that the two look across an invisible line which ought to unite instead of to divide them, with an attitude of suspicion and hostility. Prof. Whitehead of Harvard in a recent number of the *Atlantic,* makes an interesting observation on this point. He is reminding us that when a person like Mr. Einstein comes along with the announcement of a new discovery regarding the nature of light, even though his theory upsets established calculations, his associates in every country declare this to be a great victory for science. What I want to know is why, when some discovery in the field of medicine which enables us to apply certain remedies to the ills of man and therefore diminish suffering in the world, or when some great scholar like William James lays down certain laws of the mind by which we are better enabled to adjust ourselves to our circumstances—why these things are not proclaimed as great victories for religion?

Once again there is a chance for some Church to protest to the salvation of its soul—perhaps the destruction of its body, be it said,—against the expansion of industrialism to a degree which crushes out his finer instincts and makes it impossible for a man to live a normal religious life. I am not particularly interested in protests against our system of Western industrialism, which characterize certain political programs. It is a system that is here to stay whether we like it or not. But there are plenty of instances which indicate that it is a great deal worse in its effects upon human life than it need be and it is against these that I would have the Church make a protest. For weeks and weeks one of the great essential industries of the nation has been a helpless cripple. By a tragic contradiction the anthracite mines have been closed since Labor Day. I have no mind to even suggest responsibility. It is much too complicated a question, and it is pretty certain that not all the right is on one side nor all the wrong on the other. The point is that because of this disorganization men and women are compelled to live less happily, less efficiently, are bound to be less creative members of society. Therefore, I point to this incident as an opportunity for the Church to protest against the abuses of an industrial system which permits such things to go on.

Another protest which the Church may make is against such nationalism as manifests itself in Imperialism, in an unwillingness to concede to smaller countries those privileges which we have once enjoyed and upon the basis of which we have come into our position of authority and influence. When during this past summer we returned to the Chinese government the remainder of the Boxer indemnity, to be expended for purposes of educating Chinese students in this country, that was fine. Why can we not take the same large attitude, and grant to that unhappy country the privileges of its own revolution? Why must we exact promises which no country passing through revolution seeking a stable government is in a position to grant; and then capitalize her distress as a justification for our imperialistic tendencies and policies?

Here then are some of the protests, which I would make on behalf of the Church. If there is any one thing against which we need to be on our guard it is against an easy going religion. I suppose it is natural that we should get that way. For the most part we live easy lives. To be sure we have our personal problems and obstacles which are sometimes exceedingly difficult to surmount. But we are not peculiar in that respect. People in every country and of all races have to face those things. But you may readily see the difference if you compare the conditions of life which surround the average Englishman or European with the comforts and luxuries which are at the command of the American people. Now all these things which we have may be a good thing and they may not. We know how it is sometimes with an individual. It is a very difficult matter for a boy or girl brought up under conditions of luxury and affluence to learn the necessity of doing things for

themselves. The same thing is true to a large degree in religion. There may be more truth than we are willing to admit in Prof. Whitehead's statement to the effect that "religion is tending to degenerate into a decent formula wherewith to embellish a comfortable life." That is not the sort of religion we want.

Speaking of protests, a very excellent precedent was established a good many years ago by one who spoke quite plainly to his people and declared, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand."

ALSON H. ROBINSON.

Jottings

Our navy is without question the greatest in the world. It has the unbeaten and unbeatable record of losing more ships and men in time of peace than in time of war.

Lord Grey's "Memoirs," recently published, are certain to constitute a sensation of the first order. Among other things he reports the efforts of President Wilson in February, 1916, to bring about a peace conference, and the American's assurance that "should Germany refuse it, the United States would probably enter the war against Germany." This was nine months prior to the day that Wilson was re-elected because "he kept us out of war."

Bishop William Montgomery Brown has certainly turned the tables on his persecutors. Received into the fold of the Old Catholic Church and consecrated a bishop therein, he now writes to the bishops of the Episcopal Church that he will be glad to reordain them, that there may be no doubt of their place in the apostolic succession. The heretic here has the last laugh with a vengeance!

Bishop Brown, in an exclusive statement in the New York *American,* speaks of the churches as "cash-stores dealing in medieval theology." This is dreadfully impolite, but unfortunately all too true.

As talk of the security pact continues in Europe, it may be well to recall what J. Ramsay MacDonald thinks about it. Referring to the negotiations for alleged security, he says that this is "the worst thing that is now happening" for the peace of Europe. "We have had our chance to remove the causes of war; we are now only taking steps to secure victory when the next war breaks out."

The League of Nations did just exactly nothing at all at its recent meeting. Yet its adjournment was accompanied by salvos of ecstatic applause. The fact that the League meets at all seems such a marvellous thing to its supporters that they become hysterical with enthusiasm. Verily, verily some folks are easily satisfied!

J. H. H.

American Notes

(Editorial Correspondence)

I.

I met yesterday on the street the Rev. Dr. Orr of Wellington, N. Z. He has been in America several months in exchange with an American pastor. A good plan. He said, "I would give a good deal if I knew what to tell my people when I go home about the working of Prohibition." I smiled, but did not presume to tell him what to tell them. But I offered him a suggestion. He said that the chief of police, whose family was in his congregation had given him some information. I remarked that the average American would resort to the police force last, if seeking information concerning law enforcement. "But suppose you ask the leading elder of your church to call together 15 or 20 representative citizens and give you the liberty of quizzing them freely for two or three hours. You will know pretty well what, or what not, to say to your people." I am persuaded that their conclusions would run somewhat as follows: Since the adoption of prohibition, the people are more prosperous as shown in less poverty, more automobiles and larger and more savings accounts; no one would return to the days of the saloon; there is a distressing amount of law-breaking by the making of home-brew or by bootlegging; those who drink are compelled to satisfy themselves with frightful, sometimes poisonous liquor; the cost of enforcing the law is enormous, although this is cared for by the fines; the law is in the federal constitution and therefore will never be repealed; while the situation, especially in the big cities, is deplorable, yet the people will stick to it and after a decade or so the law will be accepted as one of the regular laws of the statute books; the next generation will see prohibition effectively enforced. I think Dr. Orr may safely take these words back to his people.

II.

Japan and China. I just came from a noon-day luncheon in a down-town restaurant, listening to a discussion on international affairs, especially the Orient. The two speakers at this meeting were Judge A. E. Griffith, of the Superior Court, and W. E. Priestly, a business man. In regard to the Orient they agreed on several things, and in these they doubtless represent American public opinion. "That most of our trouble in the Orient is due to the fact that a lot of 'politicians' are handling our affairs. As to the trouble in China, foreigners are to blame. The exclusion law is unfair and based upon ignorance of the real facts. If Orientals were admitted on the same basis as all other aliens

—i. e. on a quota basis—only a few hundred of them could be admitted anyway. The birth-rate of the Japanese is not alarming, several other nationalities having a higher birth-rate. America is lucky to get off as well as she has, considering the way she has treated China and Japan. There is not a single reason why there should be war on the Pacific. America would be silly to fight with either one of these Oriental peoples." I venture to say that the words of Judge Griffith—of British birth and of conservative temper—and Mr. Priestly—for many years in business in China and America—would be a snap-shot of American opinion.

III.

This will interest the young people. Last Sunday night, I heard the Right Rev. S. Arthur Huston, bishop of Olympia. He came to the defense of the younger generation to an extent that brought out criticism on the part of some of the "elders." He said that he took exception to a recent statement that the young people were "coolly critical and even contemptuous toward Christianity in contrast to the consecrated spirit of their fathers and mothers." . . . "Fathers seem to expect 100 per cent boys, from a 30 per cent example. The fathers and mothers of the young people of today are you and I—and if I were to ask some of you what kind of an example you are setting your children you'd turn purple. Young people will do as we do, and not as we say. Parents have a remarkable faculty of forgetting their own short-comings, indiscretions and sins, and vehemently denounce the rising generation for what they complacently countenance in themselves. Young people of today won't listen to sermons an hour and a half long—but they far outstrip their elders in social service." These words reveal a cross section of American life; for similar words may be heard from one end of the land to the other.

IV.

What are the farmers of America thinking about? The editor of *Information Service* has sought to find out by making a survey of 28 agricultural newspapers which have a total circulation of 8,102,984 for the year 1924. Nine of these papers are monthlies, seven semi-monthlies and fourteen weeklies. He surveyed the editorials. The total number of editorials was 841. Of these editorials 169 discussed legislation and government; 142 production; 100 economic conditions; 86 economic co-operation (mainly marketing); 74 community life and organizations; 25 distribution (besides co-operative marketing); 25 education; 23 transportation and power; 21 home life; 176 touched upon all other topics, including personals and announcements, etc. I cannot, of course, give even a resumé of the opinions advanced in these editorials, except to say that there is naturally a desire for a tariff that will protect the farmer, there is a drift toward co-operative marketing, there is considerable hostility toward proposed child-legislation, there is general doubt if production can be controlled, there is a general desire that the standard of living should be raised. The four big factors in changing rural life at present are the radio, movies, motor-cars and electricity. These, it is granted, make for greater satisfaction in rural living. Henry C. Taylor, of the United States department of Agriculture, is quoted as saying,

> Unless farmers insist upon a satisfactory standard of living and withdraw from agriculture when they are not able to maintain this living standard, prices for farm products adequate to provide such a standard of living cannot be hoped for.

The principal change affecting rural life, according to the *Country Gentleman,* is its "mechanization." This is happening at an amazingly rapid rate. Rural life is being subjected to the same forces that transformed city life—and the results seem likely to prove equally revolutionary. "The tendency of rural mechanization is toward business farming—toward corporation farming. Is the prospect terrifying? Not in the least. Instead of masses of poor inefficient peasants we shall have a relatively small, upstanding, prosperous class of farm owners able to maintain a high standard of living."

V.

What are the church people thinking about? Here is a list of questions that one congregation, Plymouth, Seattle, asked the pastor, who answered them at the evening service: 1. If we admit that life evolved out of the physical world, does it not destroy the foundations of religion? 2. If you had your way, would you abolish all denominationalism in religion? 3. Is it a good sign that so many people today say, "I am not afraid to die?" 4. Can a man rise to his best without the power of religion? 5. Can the New Birth so change a man that he be master of himself? 6. I have heard you preach at least once a Sunday for two years. I frequently hear people outside of your church say that you believe in things that are the direct opposite of what I have heard you preach. How do you account for that? 7. What is the future of Fundamentalism? 8. Is Prohibition a failure? 9. Would it not be better if we dropped religion and emphasized the moral values of life? 10. Why do you talk so much about Jesus when he belongs to a past age and did not deal with any of the problems vital to our times?—This probably represents a pretty big cross-section of the American religious mind.

VI.

Three hundred electrical engineers met last week in a convention in Seattle. To give a picture of the proceedings of the modern wizards would be impossible. They were convening in the midst of the greatest source of undeveloped hydro-electric power in the United States. The transition of increasing quantities of current to greater distances was discussed. There were differences of opinion, as for example Mr. Doherty of the General Electric held that transmission much above 300 miles was questionable from an economic standpoint, while Mr. Fortescue of the Westinghouse frankly looked forward to the time when there would be a superpower network extending over the Eastern states and perhaps eventually over a great part of the United States and Canada. A novel note in the convention was an address by the absent president of the association, Dr. Michael I. Pupin, who spoke from the Atlantic coast over 4,200 miles of wire by long distance telephone. His words and the inflections were easily followed by the large audience. It was brought out in the convention that the only limit to the appetite of the public for the use of electricity was the ability to produce it. The problem, as one speaker put it is, "how to get more 'juice' to Tom, Dick and Harry." Increased use of electricity in households and small plants has made the problem of distribution the most serious problem confronting electrical engineers, i.e. the conveying of power from the point of distribution to the consumer. And these electrical engineers have their prophets, who among other things predict artificial rain-making by electricity. Dr. Harris J. Ryan, head of the electrical

engineering department of Stanford University and past president of the American Institute of Electrical Engineers refers to the next steps as, Completion of the present phase of electric power development; Reclamation of the world's waste places, either through artificial rain-making by electrical means or by new methods of irrigation and drainage, and release of the vast storehouses of atomic energy.

"The network of railroads in America was virtually completed 25 years ago; the telephone network 10 years ago. Now we are engaged in completing a network of power lines. Our task of tomorrow may well be the age old problem of rain making; if not by electrified sand dropped through clouds that will not willingly give up their moisture, then by transfer of the water, that falls too abundantly at some points, to localities which have not enough, thus reclaiming both the desert and the jungle. And in the yet more distant future there is before us the problem of energy stored up in matter itself."

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Story of My Mind

XXVII

In the autumn of 1890, and during the following winter, I visited churches of all denominations in "Greater Boston," from the Roman Catholic through all the varieties of the Protestant sects, on to Christian Science and the numerous brands of occultism; and wrote of them in the *Evening Transcript*. Beginning early in September of that year I contributed to that daily newspaper two or three articles weekly until the middle of December. The following winter I wrote eight or ten articles about some of the larger churches in Boston, and one or two especially on the occult cults of all kinds.

I began these articles with a consideration of the causes for the larger attendance of women than men at church, and I followed them up with a general study of the religious situation in and about Boston. They attracted attention throughout the country and were widely discussed. Most of those who commented on them gave them credit for fairness, and for the absence from them of anything approaching the sectarian spirit. Several clergymen spoke to me of their kindliness, their critical justness, and their regard for the peculiarities of all religious bodies. Many of those who read them without any knowledge of the writer found it impossible to guess as to his religious affiliations. I had no sectarian purpose whatever in their writing, but, regarding the churches as an important phase of the life of our time, I studied them with reference to their worth as elements in our civilization, and as to the degree of success with which they answered to the demands of a higher form of conduct, individually and socially.

I have found that my withdrawal from the pulpit has enabled me to look at religion more freely, more sincerely, and with more critical eyes than before. When I stood in the pulpit from Sunday to Sunday I kept myself in the mental attitude for that manner of addressing the public, and I made the necessary effort to keep within the limits set for the teaching of ethics and religion in a manner not to offend the beliefs and the conventional requirements of those whom I addressed. I was not aware of any insincerity in so doing or in what I said, for I held myself to the demand of honesty and sincere speaking on all occasions. I realize now, however, that the professional attitude was not one wholly favorable to an unbiased inquiry into the truth, and the critical worth of what is taught in the name of religion. This I found, at least, that when free from the requirements of pulpit service, I soon saw the rites, the customs, the beliefs, the fundamental assumptions, of religion in a new light. I did not seek this result, and I have been much surprised to find what a change has been produced in my thinking by being wholly free from the necessity of having regard to the wishes of a congregation, and what it conventionally requires.

Years before I had ceased to occupy the pulpit regularly, I was deeply impressed by the wide chasm between religious profession and practice. It was the reading of Tolstoy, whose works I very diligently studied for several years, which led me to definitely formulate this conclusion in my own mind. While I did not agree with Tolstoy at every point, and though I recognized that his criticisms applied especially to the conditions existing in Russia, I became convinced that his objections were to be regarded as applicable to religion in all western countries. Our religion is a product of the past, and it has been revised and modified with the changes in civilization, with the result that a strange disparity exists between our creeds and our conduct. The man of business, the politician, the craftsman, the farmer, follows one set of conceptions in his daily vocation, and another in his religion. The very thought of conducting business in accordance with religious rules provokes a smile of incredulity. Especially is this gulf a wide-yawning one between science and religion. No scientific investigator for a moment considers the cardinal doctrines of religion, but wholly ignores them, as if they did not exist. To give them any heed would imply that he does not know the meanings and the methods of science. When he has laid aside his work as an investigator, he may assume the role of a religious believer, but he does not mix and confound the two spheres of thinking.

It is also true that our national life does not square with the teachings of Christianity. Although we are counted as a Christian nation, and traditionally are so in reality, it is impossible to regard our life as one having its real sources in the teachings of the New Testament in any genuine sense. We accept the creed of the early church to a large extent, but we do not in our daily work, in our recreations, in our social intercourse, in our law-making, bring ourselves to the test of the Christian profession. We grow sentimental about the high ethical standard of the Golden Rule, but we do not order our conduct in accordance with its spirit or its ethical standard. We profess to accept Jesus Christ as representative of the highest form of the divine life, repeating glibly the early Christian creeds; but who orders his business according to that conception of life?

When we give adequate attention today to the origin and nature of Christianity, we must be moved to consider it as synthetic or syncretist in character, not by any means distinctly original. We may find in it elements from nearly every religion and religious movement in the ancient world. It borrowed and amalgamated to a very large extent. Fundamentally it is of a mythological nature, inasmuch as it attributes a personal origin to life in its various manifestations. Its theory of persons and things, or what is sometimes called its scheme of salvation, is essentially mythological, not only because

of what it borrows from the older myths, but because it introduces personalities to account for the various phases of the unfolding order of human experiences.

Christianity assumes that the universe was created in time and space out of pre-existing materials (or out of nothingness) as a craftsman makes a box out of wood. This being then creates man and places him in a beautiful garden. Man is tempted by the power adverse to God, and then is cast out of his paradise. God selects a chosen people, gives them a code of laws, sends them prophets, and finally permits his own son to come into the world to die for men. This son rises from the dead, and he inspires the church until such time as he shall come in the clouds of heaven to set up his kingdom in the world. The birth of Christ from a Virgin, and his resurrection from the dead, as well as other features of this world-drama, had their origin in the mythologies of the preceding civilizations. The whole Christian story, if not mythological in the sense in which primitive and barbarian narratives of creation and a world order are, nevertheless, because it attributes all things to adventures of the gods or a God is of an undoubted mythological origin and fundamental nature.

Christian theology made from the beginning a serious attempt to escape from mythology, and it did so by giving myth an abstract and metaphysical interpretation. It took away what was beautiful in the personalities of the myth, and gave it an abstruse character. If it made use of the methods of the philosophies of the time, it did so by taking them outside all that is human, natural, and beautiful; and gave them a character at once complicated and unreal. It juggled with words, set up abstractions as supreme in the universe, and made of unrealities the very essence of all being.

Not contented with mythology and metaphysics, Christianity resorted to symbolism, and made that which naturally and humanly exists image of what does not exist. A world was projected into existence which had no reality except in symbols, and the symbols were assumed to authenticate what they were thought to represent. It was forgotten that the symbol may represent or interpret that which it is assumed to explain to us; but also that it may quite entirely fail to express what is attributed to it. The reality behind the symbol is known only by means of the symbol, and if that fails to express itself effectively, we are left without knowledge of the underlying reality.

In a practical direction Christianity has done an immeasurable disservice to mankind in its taboo upon sex and all which concerns the sexual life. In primitive society, and more especially among the Greeks, sex was regarded naturally and sanely; but Christianity interpreted it as the very source of man's degradation, the very fountain-head of his evil nature. It hid away, tried to put utterly out of sight, the sexual instincts and impulses, not only as the primary cause of evil in man's nature, but as leading to every manner of moral corruption and degeneracy. In large degree it regarded woman as the source of the sex degradation and of the moral preference for evil. It is true that the Christianity of today no longer adheres to these extreme theories; but so thoroughly has this conception been bred into the bone of Christian belief, that it is not wholly eliminated from even the more advanced sects. The ecclesiastical conception of woman, the family, and the sex life is even yet largely influenced by these early Christian and medieval theories. It is enough to say that scientific thought has utterly eliminated these ideas, so degrading and so revolting, from all its conceptions of sex and of woman.

The position of the Unitarian body, the most advanced within the limits of Christianity, has been comparatively modern and largely influenced by contemporary thought. It has been more open to the demands of reason and science than other sects. It has clung to the old in considerable measure, however, and it has been guided by considerations of ritual and spiritual tradition. To an astonishing degree, in view of its history, it has recently yielded itself to demands of ecclesiastical conformity and has clothed its pulpiteers in robes. Intellectually free, Unitarianism has been socially bound by demands of conventionality and good taste. More largely than other sects it has been active in works of charity, reform, and social progress; but it has also been of the intellectual élite and of the socially cultured and refined. These tendencies have caused it to deliberately disregard two demands of the time. Had this really modern sect accepted the methods of science, and conformed its teachings to the results of scientific method, it would have given itself a uniqueness and originality which would have been of the highest importance in securing attention to its merits. Preferring intellectual tradition and social conformity, it has lost a great opportunity, which, had it been accepted, would have given Unitarianism a rapid growth and a large influence. Its loyalty to conventional demands has put it out of sympathy with that great movement for social justice and radical reform which has been a most striking phase of the life of our time.

Here was opportunity for religion to test itself, to lead in a great world-movement, to take sides with the mass of the people, to stand side by side with the proletariat in its aspirations for a larger and freer life. The Unitarians did not comprehend this demand and this opportunity, and they went on the other side with those who conform. There will never again come to them such an opportunity. The call of science and the call of social revolution they have not heeded, and they have chosen instead the way of respectability and the way of ritualism and ecclesiastical habilaments. In this action it has remained true to religious traditions. It has accepted the word of the past, but it has forgotten the eternal demands of the present. In so doing it has ignored the needs of mankind, and has preferred what is ecclesiastical to what is human.

When we turn from the methods of religion to those of science, we find a very different conception of conduct and of the deeper meanings of life. The approach to life is radically different from that of religion, and it seeks for conclusions of quite another character. We are repeatedly assured by religious teachers that science and religion have been reconciled, and that they are no longer in antagonism with each other. It is quite true that the old quarrel between them does not rage as it did a half-century ago; but what church has brought its teachings fully into accord with science, and tested every one of its doctrines by the methods of scientific inquiry? The very suggestion of such a process appeals to us as comical rather than as serious and practicable. It is an escape from the demands of science which the religious teacher endeavors to secure by some method of intellectual gymnastics, rather than its unqualified acceptance. At the same time, science is distinctly opposed to much that is taught in the name of religion, to its survivals from periods of barbarism, and to its high-toned metaphysics, which can by no process be brought to the test either of science or life.

Our modern intellectual life makes it difficult to accept many of the teachings of theology, however willing we are to do so. As soon as we come into contact with the problems raised by serious thinking, whether we are led by the spirit of science or by that of the general culture of the age, we find many difficulties confronting us, which are not known to the person who accepts the teachings he receives in youth with implicit confidence. We are confronted with belief in God, and how to reconcile that belief with natural law, the orderly processes of nature, and the methods of evolution. Science assures us that all existing phenomenal conditions have grown out of those which preceded them, and that so far as we can go back we find no change from that process. The philosopher will bring to us assurances that God is essential to the conception of order, law, life, and ultimate truth; but his methods and conclusions are quite beyond the mental capacities of the ordinary man, who must believe on the testimony of others or accept the suggestions of nature and its processes.

Turning once again to science, in order that we may secure a basis of comparative study, we find that its conclusions tend towards certain definite results. The first of these is, that all religions are fundamentally of the same origin and nature, manifestations of man's emotional attitude towards the universe. Another is, that science cannot accept dogmas of any kind, and least of all those which are metaphysical in their nature. Religion being an expression of feeling it manifests itself in forms which appeal to the emotional elements in human nature. In its ritual, symbols, arts, music, it satisfies the demand for emotional expression, and for ideals which shall interpret what we conceive life ought to become.

Bringing religion to the test of modern knowledge, we must recognize that science only can answer all questions of origin, law, purpose, and fundamental fact. Any attempt to solve these problems by tradition or by theological reasoning proves false in method and in results. If we wish to know how our world came into existence, science has the only answer which is worthy of consideration. If we desire to gain a large and universal conception of the universe, it is to science alone we are to turn for a worthy solution of the problem suggested by that aim. For the most part, religion has not as yet faced squarely the evolution hypothesis, natural selection, naturalism, natural law, and the conception of the self-sufficiency of nature. It beats about the bush, seeks to avoid the inevitable conclusion that the universe has come into existence by the workings of natural causes, and has not reconciled these conclusions with its conception of a personal God. To a very large extent its teachings are traditional, come to us from ages far away, before science had reached more than an incipient development. Preachers talk of God as if he lived in the next street, and as if he could be appealed to to set right all which is wrong in their own human affairs or in those of their parishioners. They present a parochial conception of the universe, as if God were another than themselves standing in a pulpit and discoursing to mankind. To a very large extent the pulpit is a coward's castle, a retreat into which men go when they do not wish to be answered back by the thinking men and women in their congregations. The preachers give forth honeyed words of optimism, good-will, and love to one another, when they might well face squarely the stupendous problems which confront the world and demand solution. The pulpit does not stand frankly before the social and industrial problems of the day, but talks to those comfortable in their pews, and who wish to have nothing said that brings home to them the wrongs of the economic life. The plea that the pulpit has nothing to do with anything but the spiritual interests of mankind simply begs the question, and shows how cowardly are the men who resort to that plea. The church, if it is to continue to influence men and women who think, must have to do with poverty, crime, and vice; and it must give to the people unequivocally its solution of these evils, which must be the remedy provided by science. It cannot shirk that duty, and then demand that the people shall listen respectfully to its teachings.

GEORGE WILLIS COOKE.

(*Concluded.*)

THE STUDY TABLE

Race in Politics

A new book by Lothrop Stoddard is sure to attract attention. He is always interesting, generally entertaining, usually exasperating. For readers who know something of the material with which Mr. Stoddard deals—which now he calls "biology – the science of race"—his books do no harm; most readers do not know the material and are not able to judge how far Mr. Stoddard is scientific in his argument. A professional anthropologist, in reviewing a book by a brilliant Frenchman, lately said: "The best thing I can find to say, in conclusion, of Finot's work, is that it is a direct opposite to Grant's 'Passing of the Great Race.' If the latter book is poison, Finot's is an appropriate antidote." Well, Madison Grant and Lothrop Stoddard are avowed chums. They paddle in the same Nordic canoe. They suffer from the same nightmares; they nourish the same unwarranted admirations and cherish the same pet aversions. Stoddard's new book, "Racial Realities in Europe,"[1] is Nordic, of course; it is also Anglomaniac. The author is a little belated in recognizing the importance of race in history, in politics, in world-movement. He is naive in his joy of discovery. His fundamental idea is sound, but is it new? The idea that Sweden has differed from Italy in historical development and character largely because of race difference is surely *not* new. Race is of vast importance. Unquestionably, who does not know it? Who has not known it? Geography too has its part in making nations; Mr. Stoddard recognizes the fact. There are other elements to be considered. Any study that overstresses one influence, no matter how fundamental it may be, misleads. The influence of race deserves study and all students will hail thoughtful and profound investigations in that direction. Mr. Stoddard has written an interesting book, that will be widely read. Unfortunately it will deepen prejudice and encourage aggression, just when neither needs deepening and encouragement. It is the easiest thing in the world to set up a Nordic standard, and to damn everything else. It would be just as easy for non-Nordics to define their criteria of judgment and to condemn the unfair "fair white." It might be justifiable; it would perhaps be dangerous. As he has written the

[1] "Racial Realities in Europe." Lothrop Stoddard. New York: 1924. Charles Scribner's Sons. 16mo; pp. 252.

book, it is a pity that Mr. Stoddard has accepted Ripley's too simple and easy recognition of the three types of which we hear so much in these days—the Nordic, the Alpine, the Mediterranean. If one is to discuss Racial Realities in Europe, Deniker is a better guide than Ripley and some of the queer things that Stoddard leaves unclear, would have been nearer to explanation. But for the ordinary reader, to be inflamed and aroused, the fewer elements we have to juggle, the better. How protean are the forms of Nordic salvation! Is it not curious, if a little strain of Nordic in the population of the Iberian peninsula led to the great development of Spain in the sixteenth century, that pure Nordic (!) Britain should have lagged at that time? In popular ethnology of today—excuse me, in the popular "biology – the science of race"—the experience through which mythology and folk-lore have passed is being repeated. Sun myths were once the great solution; everything was explained by reference to the orb of day. Then came Aryan craze, when every tale and story traced to fermentation of one poor brain. It has been suggested that the writers of those times, who went to interesting and alluring extremes had been looking at the sun so long and steadily, that they were suffering from after-images and saw the sun wherever they looked. Perhaps we are doing the same thing now. One may stand too long in rapt adoration before that lovely vision—tall, long-headed, fair-skinned, blue-eyed and golden-haired (or red perhaps). The impression may become so vivid that all else is blurred, or that it occupies the entire field.

Brigadier-general Morgan was one of the Inter-Allied Commission of Control in Germany and for four years was in that country to see that the defeated nation was actually carrying out the disarmament that had been forced upon her by the treaty of Versailles. On November 23, 1923 he gave a lecture in the University of London, on "The Present State of Germany."[2] This lecture is contained in the book before us, together with an introduction, which begins with the words:

> The publishers have requested me either to expand this lecture or to write an introduction to it. Of the two evils I prefer the latter. The lecture is therefore printed exactly as it was delivered, without attenuation and without emphasis, nothing is added and nothing is taken away.

The introduction is extended, filling thirty-eight pages, while the original lecture occupies but sixty-one. The lecture caused some flutter. To some it was pro-German, to others it was too friendly to France. It aims to be honest and is a serious presentation, deserving serious consideration. General Morgan feels that mistakes have been made, are making. At the moment when the lecture was delivered, he felt the situation in the Ruhr to be most unhappy. Germany is disarmed, but re-armament is not impossible; it would not require as much time as most people assume. If there is peace in Europe, Germany must be allowed to make recovery. She must breathe naturally—not be choked at intervals until death threatens and then to be left gasping, to be choked again and again. (The figure is not Morgan's.) Our author holds that German national consciousness has reached the conviction that the Allies have sought and still seek her annihilation. He feels that

> it was a fatal policy to impose a vague floating charge over all her assets, whether public property in the shape of State undertakings or private in the shape of taxable capacity, to defer the assessment of that charge and, I think—though this is debatable—to exclude all appeals to an impartial tribunal against the weight of it. The allies appear to have overlooked the fact that men live by hope, if not by faith, and that no man will work to the last hour of the day if he labors under the conviction that all the fruits of his toil will be annexed by another.

In a Germany rendered *desperate,* our author sees the greatest possible menace to Europe at large. In fact he uses the figure of the captive Samson, "If she is to go down into the abyss, she is determined to drag all Europe down with her." The book is not a pro-German appeal. It is the most friendly possible word of warning to the Allies. He considers suicide a crime; but he believes Germany is bound to suicide, rather than to suffer. The crime, if crime it be, is inevitable unless active steps of prevention are taken. Speaking for ourself and not implicating General Morgan, we doubt that the Dawes plan has solved, or will solve the problem. It diverts attention for the moment; but, when the weary grinding at the wheel and the dancing for the amusement of those who look on the anguish with glee continues too long, the catastrophe is inevitable.

"Czecho-Slovakia"[3] is "a survey of economic and social conditions." It is a convenient handbook regarding the new republic, now seven years old. They have been difficult years. Not only had a new state to be declared, a government organized, relations with other countries established; there had to be a reorganization of industries, a readjustment of social conditions, a reassertion of internal control. For centuries the area had been restive under a domination and direction felt to be foreign; for decades there had been well-directed purposive efforts to separation and independence. The movement came in 1918 and, at the signing of the treaties, a new nation emerged—hopeful and looking forward. It remains to be seen whether it is to endure and be strong. Race and language have great influence in politics and must be reckoned with, but they are not everything. One may doubt that the union between Czech and Slovak will endure; one may doubt that the significance of the Danube is past; one may wonder whether Czecho-Slovakia will not still find her most natural focus of interest at Vienna. These doubts and wonderings may or may not be warranted. They are beside the question. The Czecho-Slovakian Republic exists and we have before us a convenient and useful manual of information regarding it. The book consists of nineteen chapters, all by specialists of standing. They are brought together under the editorship of Dr. Vaclav Verunac of Prague. They cover the entire field of economic and social conditions. This kind of joint labor by a group of specialists is popular at present and is thought to give a feeling of authority. It is subject to overlapping and uneven development. For our own part we confess to liking a book by a single author, consistently and symmetrically developed, with some style and literary charm where possible. In such a work as this, the opportunity for style and charm is limited. The matter is necessarily statistical and must be presented baldly. The book contains a wealth of material, compactly presented. It also discusses some of the urgent problems and trends and tendencies. Thus the land problem and agrarian reform is presented in detail. It is a sample of the many and serious questions by which the nation is faced.

[2] "The Present State of Germany." J. H. Morgan. Boston: (1924). Small, Maynard and Co. 16mo; pp. 107.

[3] "Czecho-Slovakia." Edited by Josef Gruber. New York: 1924. The Macmillan Co. 16mo; pp. xix, 256.

This time, it is a book about the Near East. Mr. Luke is already known for various writings about this part of the world. "The Fringe of the East" and "The City of Dancing Dervishes" are favorably known; his "Cyprus Under the Turks" is in a different strain, but a valuable contribution; the Handbooks of "Palestine" and "Cyprus," in which he had collaboration, are well done. He has long been interested in the Turk and the peoples with whom the Turk has had to do throughout the Levant. He knows through intimate contact and practical experience. His new book, "Anatolica,"[4] is "a miscellany of the Near East." It consists of ten essays, distributed between Mount Athos and European Turkey, Cyprus, The Holy Land, and Transcaucasia. Our author loves scenery, flowers, architecture; he is permeated with the history of the Levant; he has sympathy for Turk and Infidel; he has an eye for the picturesque and a heart for the sentimental; his interest in and knowledge of religions and sects is extraordinary. His book is dedicated to Admiral de Robeck, upon whose staff he gave service in 1919-1920. The essays differ in appeal and interest. It is more difficult for Mr. Luke to give a general picture, such as *Le doux pays de Chypre,* than a special study such as *Mount Athos in Peace and War, The Old Seraglio,* or *The Holy Sepulchre.* Though he has long known his field, the bulk of the book is made up of material dating after the armistice. In *Cities of Transcaucasia,* he deals specifically with the period from 1917 to 1920. The region known as Transcaucasia "separated from Russia in November, 1917, on the assumption of power in Petrograd by the Bolsheviks, when the Georgians in concert with the Armenians, and the Tatars of Ganja (Elisabetpol) and Baku, established the joint Transcaucasian Republic. This state, breaking up after five weeks of existence, owing to fundamental differences, in race, religion, civilization and national aspirations between its component parts, dissolved into the Republics of Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan." The three have collapsed before Bolshevik onslaught. The Transcaucasian cities here considered are the capitals, past and present, of these lands—especially Tiflis, Baku, Echimiadzin and Batum. The author is at his happiest in his accounts of Tiflis and Echimiadzin. He is always best in description of buildings and religious ceremonies. A hint of attitude and style may be gained from his characterization of the last of the four districts touched upon in the book:

> Transcaucasia is not the Moslem East, it is not the Byzantine or Slavonic East, it is not the Latin East, where Moslem architecture is grafted so happily on to Gothic in the lands of the Crusaders. It represents something far older and wilder, something thrown up by the clash not of an ancient Asia and a modern Europe, but of an ancient Asia and an equally ancient Europe. It is a meeting-ground of faiths among which Christianity and Islam are very young indeed. . . .

The Reference Shelf is a sensible and useful enterprise. It is intended to assist students of special subjects, to refer them to literature, to present both sides of disputed questions. It is intended particularly to help public speakers and debaters in the preparation for their efforts. Each number deals with a single topic and is issued in neat and substantial form, but the numbers are grouped into volumes and the purchaser may subscribe for a volume to be supplied in parts as the numbers appear, or buy the single numbers independently. The scope of the undertaking is suggested by the fact that numbers have appeared on the cancellation of the Allied debts, the Ku Klux Klan, the French occupation of the Ruhr, restriction of immigration. The number before us is "Independence for the Philippines."[5] It is gotten out in the usual form. It consists of an Introduction, a Brief, a Bibliography, and Reprints. The *Brief* is a fair and comprehensive presentation—an outline of introduction (wherein the possible methods of dealing with the question are stated), then of the affirmative, then of the negative argument. The *Bibliography* is ample and covers the live and accessible literature—general, affirmative, and negative references being given separately and books being listed apart from magazine articles. Three-fourths of the book consist of *Reprints* of entire or part articles, which seem to represent fairly the views of representative authors on both sides of the question. The work is well done and the presentation seems well-balanced and helpful. The Philippine question is one of real importance. The disquieting fact connected with it has been popular apathy. We have the fate of millions of individuals in our hands, yet few have cared what we did in the matter. The present interest is encouraging. What is necessary is study, investigation, serious thought. We hope that this little book will serve to stimulate and develop the really healthy interest that has recently been shown.

FREDERICK STARR.

[4] "Anatolica." Harry Charles Luke. London: 1924. Macmillan and Co., Ltd. (New York: The Macmillan Co.) 16mo; pp. 210.

[5] "Independence for the Philippines." Julia E. Johnson, Compiler. New York: 1924. The H. W. Wilson Co. 16mo; pp. 99.

The First Woman

Some fifty-five years ago, when Professor Charles Frederick Hartt, of Cornell, was imperial geologist of Brazil, he came across a poem in Portuguese which gave an account of the origin of woman, quite unlike that currently accepted by literalists. This poem, he asked me, as one of his students at the time, to put into English verse.

Both original and translation have passed into oblivion, but the fancy concerned is perhaps worth recording.

The poem goes into details as to the beauties of the garden (presumably Eden) in which the first man (apparently Adam) found himself placed. But as time went on, Adam became lonely and disconsolate, with nothing to do. So, according to the poet, using his right toe on his left foot, "he stood dismally scratching his heel." Meanwhile "a tear welled out from his eye and fell at his feet."

Then the poem continues:

> God took up that tear, and He made it a woman,
> He smiled—and He gave her that smile as her seal:
> And when by his side in the garden He placed her,
> Then Adam no longer stood scratching his heel.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

CORRESPONDENCE

MILITARISM IN CANADIAN SCHOOLS

Editor of UNITY:

Under the guise of "Physical training" the Federal Department of Militia is invading the schools of the provinces of Canada. In the year 1915-16 $84,972.05 was spent on Cadet training in Canada, and in 1924-25 $367,829.34. The number of cadet corps in the nine provinces in 1914 was 61,911, and in 1925 it is 125,522, according to official information tabled at Ottawa during the recent session.

During the 1925 session of the Manitoba Legislature, W. Ivens, M.L.A., asked the Department of Education for the number of cadet corps in the schools of the province; the number of school principals who were cadet instructors, etc. The Minister of Education replied that he had not the necessary information, but would get it from the Militia Department. On May 18th, 1925, Capt. Chandler, of the Militia Dept., informed the Minister of Education that the District Officer Commanding had instructed him to say that this information could not be given. That means that the military authorities refused to give the educational authorities the information desired.

Education in Canada lies wholly within the realm of Provincial jurisdiction, and the Federal authorities have no right whatever to interfere with education according to the British North America Act. J. S. Woodsworth, M.P., during discusion of the vote for $400,000 for Cadet Training in the Parliament at Ottawa challenged Minister of Militia Macdonald as to this invasion, and was told that the military authorities entered no school unless the Supt. of Education in the province concerned approved the application. Mr. Woodsworth replied with documents to show that in Manitoba the Minister of Education had given no such authority, hence the military authorities had invaded the schools without legal authority.

The minister of militia stated that the Department did not take the initiative in organizing cadet corps in the schools, nevertheless some thirteen military officers in the different provinces give all or part of their time to cadet corps. Capt. Chandler is advocating the formation of corps in the schools of Manitoba and has circularized the school principals to form corps.

The defence of the Minister of Militia is that the cadet system is not military. He said (Hansard, June 24th, 1925) ". . . physical training is the basis of the whole system of cadet training and the military exercises are only an incident." This was not allowed to go unchallenged and several members stated that the fact that Cadet Training was advocated by and paid for by the Department of Militia made it clear that "The vote is clearly a vote for military purposes."

Miss Agnes McPhail, M.P., Canada's only woman member of Parliament dealt with the "Physical training" phase. She stated that military exercises were not conducive to developing physique, and quoted Dr. Dudley A. Sargent, physical instructor of Harvard, and the *Boston Medical Journal* to the effect that the great military nations of Europe, realizing the inadequacy of military drill to develop physique, gave all recruits "from three to twelve months gymnastic training to develop them as men before they are expected to conform to the requirements of the soldier." If this claim is correct, then the claim of the military authorities that cadet training is for the purpose of developing the physique falls to the ground and the invasion of the schools of Canada for purely militaristic training is demonstrated. Just how rifle practice, etc., is classed as "physical exercise" is difficult to see in any case.

Winnipeg, Canada. WILLIAM IVENS.

Editor of UNITY:

Yesterday I read your review of Dr. Frothingham's "Edward Everett" in UNITY in which you ask the searching question: "Why was not so great a man much greater? Why did not a man of such ability, training and character play a much more sustained and important role in the history of his age? Today I was reading that charming two-volume work "The Life and Letters of Edward Everett Hale" by Edward E. Hale, Jr., when suddenly I came upon this:

"The foremost literary figure of the earlier generation was possibly my father's uncle, Edward Everett, a man of the utmost literary adaptability who had at this time (1830-40) already been pastor of Brattle Street Church, student at Göttingen, professor at Harvard College, editor of the North American Review and governor of the state. But it was perhaps on account of Edward Everett's immense facility that he never became truly great. Without difficulty he became a pre-eminent figure in the slightly lettered American civilization of his day. Perhaps he was never called on to make a real effort that demanded his whole power." (See Vol. I, page 198.)

This is by no means an adequate answer to the question you raise. I do not offer it as such. It seems to be only a conjecture but rather significant coming from the grand-nephew of Edward Everett. At any rate it came to me so soon upon your review, I thought I would send it along.

Cordially,

NORMAN D. FLETCHER.

WAS BRYAN A PRETENDER?

I read with interest your obituary editorial concerning William Jennings Bryan in the last number of UNITY. As I read my mind went back through the years to the time I first heard Bryan in the Campaign of 1896 at a time when he ended a magnificent oration with his famous "Cross of gold" peroration. At that time my reason rejected his line of political economy but I was almost persuaded by his winning personality and his fervid oratory. Many times since I have felt the spell of Bryan, and many times I have felt the tragedy of his weakness and lack of logic at the very time when his friends looked to him to do great things in the face of such opportunities as few men have ever had.

You say that "The last act of his drama . . . . was as logical as it is pitiful. We count it a mercy to his own best fame that the curtain was so suddenly rung down." But you make no mention of the epilogue, the saddest close which he could have had.

For years Bryan went up and down the land giving his famous lecture on "The Prince of Peace."

For years he has borne the name of "Pacifist" and has been the object of the finger of scorn because he was believed to be an advocate of the doctrine of "peace at any price." There came a day when the Grim Reaper appeared and the "Great Commoner" was gathered to his fathers, and then was made public the real facts, and then was laid bare the inner life of the man. By his own wish, recorded when he was in the full vigor of life and health, he was buried among the soldier dead amid the graves of those who lived by the sword and died by the sword and who were not afraid to let all the world know that they were men of war.

When he went to his grave we are told that his body was guarded by three companies of artillery with the flags in evidence, and the music of the march was the beat of the hoofs of warhorses. His epitaph is "William Jennings Bryan, Colonel of Infantry."

Lo, how the mighty have fallen. We may well imagine how the Phillistines rejoiced when they saw and heard of that funeral.

We are all more or less inconsistent, and we are also prone to criticize, but we well may ask—what was the matter? Was Bryan a hypocrite? Was he a pretender? We will not say anything so harsh concerning him. In a figurative sense he wrote his own epitaph, and he fixed his own place in contemporary life, and the best that we can wish is that posterity will be kind to him and believe that in best moments he was all that the world thought him to be.

GEORGE L. THOMPSON.

Great Oaks, East Bridgewater, Mass.

A QUESTION

Dear Mr. Holmes:

Would you have tried to start a Peace-at-any-Price Society the week before the battle of Marathon or Salamis? Or just before the battle of Lexington or Bunker Hill? If not, then it seems that the whole question of fighting is *when* must we fight. Please answer in UNITY's columns for the benefit of your many readers.

J. E. MCCALL.

[It seems curious that so many persons persist in doubting that non-resistants mean what they say—that they will not fight under any circumstances. It seems equally curious that these same persons do not know their history—that in the Revolutionary War, for example, there were many non-resistants, Quakers and others, who refused to take up arms against the British. Non-resistants believe in peace at any price before Marathon or Lexington or at any time. They are ready to take their chances with other weapons than those of arms.—J. H. H.]

THE FIELD

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion"

A STATEMENT

The Emergency Foreign Policy Conference believes that the United States government should at once tender its friendly offices as mediator in an effort to terminate the war now waging between the Riffians and European powers in North Africa.

* * *

The United States materially assisted by its mediation in bringing to a close the war between Japan and Russia. In the World War the United States early endeavored to find a common ground of agreement between the belligerents; if more vigorously pushed these efforts might have brought the war to a close prior to the entrance of the United States at a time and on terms which would have greatly benefitted the entire world, the victors as well as the vanquished.

The Riffian leaders have recently indicated a desire to reach a ground of common agreement with the powers with whom they are at war. The greatest obstacles to such an agreement appear to lie in the prestige of nations and of political parties within nations. The real interests of the European peoples directly involved, as of the Riffians, favor an immediate settlement based on recognition of those principles of self-determination of peoples and international co-operation for which the world war was ostensibly fought and for which the Emergency Foreign Policy Conference now stands.

The fact that the Riff is not a great power, but is inhabited by a sparse independence-loving population never entirely dominated by any European nation, raises no less an issue of principle. International justice applies equally to small countries as to great, as the world's attitude toward Belgium proves. The World War should also have demonstrated sufficiently that a small war in a remote section of the earth may spread quickly and unexpectedly. The war in North Africa has already aroused the jealousies and the ambitions of other powers than those at first directly involved. The United States cannot afford to omit any effort, apart even from considerations of humanity and justice, to put out the flame before it spreads, if only from the point of view of American self-interest and America's stake in European stability and prosperity.

EMERGENCY FOREIGN POLICY CONFERENCE
1414 Monadnock Block
Chicago, Illinois.

THE UNIVERSAL CHRISTIAN CONFERENCE

Stockholm, August 30th. (By mail to UNITY.)—The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work ended its two weeks' meetings with a service today in the national shrine, the Cathedral at Uppsala, 50 miles north of Stockholm. The leading repersentative of the Orthodox Churches, Patriarch Photios of Alexandria took part, reciting the Eastern form of the Nicene Creed. This form of the Nicene Creed speaks of the Holy Spirit as proceeding from the Father, while the customary Western form speaks of the Spirit as proceeding from both the Father and the Son.

Unimportant as this difference seems today, it was the nominal cause of the split between Eastern and Western Churches a thousand years ago. In all that time there has been no effective co-operation. Here today the custom of a thousand years has been broken and in a great official gathering of both East and West, the Eastern form of the Creed has been given a place. The Orthodox delegates were quick to catch the significance of the act—that in meeting great practical Christian duties of today and in trying to bind up the wounds of the war and reconcile the nations, East and West must think of such points of doctrine as of secondary importance. The Patriarch repeated the Creed in Greek and the slight difference in phrasing was not easily perceived. The Cathedral was full to overflowing, and two thousand people waited outside. Many high dignitaries of Sweden, including the Crown and his staff, were present.

Yesterday a message to the Churches was adopted with but four dissenting votes. One of them was so cast because the message did not condemn war as strongly as the delegate wished; however, there is a strong statement against war in the document. The message is not a list of findings. It is a call to "confession, thanksgiving, study and service." It makes no attempt at precise solutions of particular problems. In the phrase of the Archbishop of Dublin, it "does not try to save the world by resolutions." This will not satisfy many in the Church, and was not satisfactory to all the delegates, who recognized, however, that the ends in view would be better attained than by recommendations about particular objects, for example the League of Nations, to which all the delegates would not consent. The Conference felt that its greatest contribution was to assert the ideal and encourage particular groups to apply the principles in their own countries. Its mind was that it had met not so much to teach as to learn, and that resolutions were not nearly so important as the carrying of the spirit of the Conference into the home Churches.

Message to Labor

A message to labor was included. It had been asked for early in the Conference, and is very brief. It reads, "In the name of the Son of Man, the Carpenter of Nazareth, we send this message to the workers of the world. Thankful for all those who, even under present difficult conditions, are acting in accordance with the principles of Jesus Christ, we deplore the causes of misunderstanding and estrangement which still exist and desire to remove them. We share the workers' aspirations after a juster social order, through which the opportunity shall be assured for the development, according to God's design, of the full manhood of every man."

The appeal to the Youth Movement reads as follows: "We turn to the young. With keen appreciation we have heard of their aspirations and efforts for a better social order as expressed in the youth movements of many lands. We desire to enlist the ardor and energy of youth, the freshness and fullness of their life, in the service of the Kingdom."

There is also an appeal to the intellectual classes, who in many countries are in danger of being estranged from the Church, in the following words: "We think also of those who are seeking Truth, so Christ's Church heartily welcomes every advance of reason and conscience among men. Particularly we would invite the co-operation of those teachers and scholars who in many special realms possess the influence and command the knowledge without which the solution of our pressing practical problems is impossible."

Fellowship of Service

The message also calls on "all followers of Christ" to accept personal responsibility in social service, and to join in the wider fellowship of the Churches beyond the bounds of any particular communion. The Conference has, if it has done anything, represented that wider fellowship of service. Thirty-seven nations have been represented in it, and in each nation the greater number of Christian communions have sent delegates. The official list includes the United States, Great Britain, the Irish Free State, Australia, East Africa, the Union of South Africa, Burma, Canada, Hongkong, India, Malaya, Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Esthonia, Finland, France, Germany, Holland, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Roumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Jugoslavia, Egypt, Nubia, Palestine, Bulgaria, Greece, China, Persia (the Assyrian Church), Japan, and Brazil (Committee on Co-operation in Latin America).

TRUE EUROPEANS

Editor of UNITY:

I do not know what Porche means by "true Europeans."*

But these names represent characters that are precious in my estimation:

Ellen Key, Eden Phillpotts, M. P. Willcocks, Thomas Hardy, Pio Baroja, Fritz Kreisler, Edward Carpenter, Leon Bazalgette, Henri Barbusse, Georges Duhamel, Fridtjof Nansen, John Galsworthy, W. N. Ewer, H. W. Massingham, Dora Sigerson Shorter, W. Loftus Hare, Bertrand Russell, Sylvia Pankhurst, Austin Harrison, Hubert W. Peet, Sir Will Orpen.

All these transcended national boundaries in the time of the great slaughter. But not Maeterlinck and not Wells—both wrote unspeakably ugly things in war time.

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

*See "Jottings" in UNITY, September 21, page 23.

A FRIEND WRITES US!

Editor of UNITY:

In sending you another dollar to keep my subscription going, I want to tell you how much pleasure and benefit I have derived from reading your paper. As one other correspondent stated, it is one of the few papers I always read. . . .

Your advocacy of the outlawry of war is splendid . . .

Finmoore, Canada. N.

A Continuation Committee has been appointed by unanimous vote of the delegates. Commission after commission in making its report pointed out the necessity of a permanent agency to study the economic and charitable tasks of the Churches in all countries, to act as a fact-finding body for the Churches, to provide unprejudiced information on subjects of concern to them, and to issue a periodical. These plans have, in general, been adopted, the Committee being given authority "to consider how effect can be given to the suggestions which have been made." It is also "to examine the practicability of calling another such Conference at a future date." Its American members chosen by the American Section are Rev. Drs. Peter Ainslie, A. J. Brown, Wm. Adams Brown, S. Parkes Cadman, Harold Lynn Hough, Shailer Mathews, S. H. Chester, E. R. Pfatteicher, Frederick Lynch, W. Y. Bell (representing the colored people of America), and H. A. Atkinson, and Bishops Brent and Cannon. From Great Britain are the Bishop of Winchester, the Archbishop of Dublin, the Bishop of Lichfield, the Dean of Canterbury, Rev. Drs. A. E. Garvie, J. A. McClymont and R. I. Drummond, Miss Lucy Gardner, and Sir Wm. Ashley. Members have also been appointed by the national groups of Europe and by the Orthodox Church.

YOUTH DEMANDS OUTLAWRY

Youth demands the immediate outlawry and complete abolition of the institution of international war as the only basis for enduring world peace. The American Fellowship of Youth for Peace, therefore, will further only such programs for the entrance of the United States into the Permanent Court of International Justice as contains the fundamental principle that war shall be declared an international crime and outlawed by the nations of the world, including in the court adequate representation of the rights of oppressed people.

Accordingly, the Fellowship of Youth for Peace welcomes the harmony agreement between the leaders of the Court and Outlawry forces of the country, and accepts it as the basis for an immediate and thoroughgoing educational campaign this Fall among the youth of America.

In this task we call upon youth movements of the world for co-operation. United in our World League of Youth, this generation which has experienced war can outlaw and abolish war.

[Resolution adopted by Conference of Fellowship of Youth for Peace, September 10, 1925.]

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel., Atlantic 1876

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Monroe 6940 732 W. Van Buren St., CHICAGO

For Happy Health!

Drink a glassful of Bowman's Milk. You'll like it, for Bowman's Milk is full cream milk. It is always rich and pure. In it are the elements so necessary for happy health!

Make it a habit to drink a glass of Bowman's Milk at every meal.

Insist on

BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE AT PORTER'S 4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM DOMESTIC COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028

Main Office 608 S. Dearborn St.

CHICAGO

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. *and* Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

OCTOBER

Marks the possibility of real savings in Autumn and Winter wardrobes. For thru the use of this Service many previously worn garments—of men, women and children—may be recovered to further usefulness and good appearance. Fine equipment, experience and skill combine towards making our cleansing so dependable.

Schumann & Co Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0231 : : : : : ALL DEPARTMENTS MAIN OFFICE AND WORK

3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

Subscribe for and read UNITY

224